

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAEASIS



THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
CONTEXT AND CRITERIA OF SELECTION AS VARIABLES
IN SOCIO METRIC NOMINATIONS

by



LEO JOSEPH DESROCHERS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1969

Thesis
1969
40

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend
to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled
"Context and Criteria of Selections as Variables in Sociometric
Nominations" submitted by Leo J. Desrochers in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

The present thesis examines the utility of grouping sociometric "elites" according to the questions used to elicit the nominations. Each sociometric question may be classified as to whether it elicits a personal or an impersonal response (as exemplified by the selection of a role model or a "key" person in a clique, respectively), and whether it requires the invoking of subjective as opposed to objective criteria (as exemplified by the selection of a most desired friend or an athlete, respectively). Four logical possibilities emerge from cross-classifying these two dimensions. Thus, sociometric questions may evoke (a) personal contexts and subjective criteria, (b) personal contexts and objective criteria, (c) impersonal (situational) contexts and subjective criteria, or (d) impersonal (situational) contexts and objective criteria.

The utility of the above four-fold typology of sociometric questions is assessed through three main hypotheses. First, there will be greater consensus when the context of elite nomination is impersonal than when the context is personal. Second, there will be greater consensus when objective criteria, as opposed to subjective criteria of selection, are elicited by sociometric items. And third, the higher the status, the more positive the self-evaluation.

The data consists of sociometric nominations and related socio-emotional information gathered in a survey conducted in Lebanese high schools.

The findings support the first two hypotheses. The implications of these results in terms of the utility of the present approach are

discussed in the thesis. There was no support for the third hypothesis which predicts a positive correlation between sociometric status and self-evaluation. A few explanations are given to account for the failure of the third prediction.

Further research in similar directions would seem to be analytically fruitful and a few suggestions are made with regards to directions that might be followed in future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ARE DUE

To Dr. B. Abu-Laban who chaired my committee and kindly allowed me to use data gathered in his 1965 Lebanese Youth Survey. Dr. Abu-Laban's critical comments and constant encouragement proved most valuable through all stages of the project.

To Dr. D. Whiteside and Dr. M. Clark whose encouragement and suggestions never relented throughout the critical periods encountered while the thesis was being written.

To Wayne McVey, Charles Lyon and Ilze Skujins whose advice and suggestions made possible the drafting of the sociometric matrices used for illustrative purposes.

To Walter Muir and Bill Stewart who wrote a Fortran program which handled the matrix inversions.

To Arlene Lyon whose excellent typing produced the final thesis draft as it now appears.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM.....	1
A Problem of Comparability in the Study of Sociometric Status.....	2
Context of Nomination as a Variable in the Measurement of Sociometric Status.....	3
Criteria of Selection as a Variable.....	4
The Grouping of Elites.....	5
Footnotes.....	8
II. DATA AND PROCEDURES.....	11
Data Source.....	11
The Sample.....	11
The Data as Related to the Present Study.....	11
Sociometric Status.....	13
Consensus.....	14
Footnotes.....	17
III. LOGICAL POSSIBILITIES AND CONSENSUS.....	18
Context of Nomination and Consensus.....	18
Criteria of Selection and Consensus.....	20
Footnote.....	24
IV. STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION.....	25
Elites and Self-Evaluation.....	27
V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	35
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	38
APPENDIX A.....	41

APPENDIX B.....	44
APPENDIX C.....	47
APPENDIX D.....	52
APPENDIX E.....	60

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Context of Nomination and Consensus on Elite Selection...	19
II	Criteria of Selection and Consensus on Elite Selection...	19
IIIa	Criteria of Selection and Consensus, by Context of Nomination.....	22
IIIb	Context of Nomination and Consensus, by Criteria of Selection.....	23
IV	Elite Types and Self-Evaluation.....	30
V	Elite Types and Self-Evaluation, by Perceived Performance	31
VI	Elite Types and Self-Evaluation, by Clique Membership....	32
VIIa	Context of Nomination and Self-Evaluation.....	33
VIIb	Criteria of Selection and Self-Evaluation.....	33
VIII	Criteria of Selection and Self-Evaluation, by Context of Nomination.....	34
IX	Friendship Status and Self-Evaluation.....	48
X	Role Model Status and Self-Evaluation.....	48
XI	Most Desired Friend Status and Self-Evaluation.....	49
XII	Athlete Status and Self-Evaluation.....	49
XIII	Best Student Status and Self-Evaluation.....	50
XIV	Best Dressed Status and Self-Evaluation.....	50
XV	Key Student Status and Self-Evaluation.....	51
XVI	Friendship Status and Self-Evaluation, by Perceived Performance.....	53
XVII	Role Model Status and Self-Evaluation, by Perceived Performance.....	54
XVIII	Most Desired Friend Status and Self-Evaluation, by Perceived Performance.....	55

TABLE		PAGE
XIX	Athlete Status and Self-Evaluation, by Perceived Performance.....	56
XX	Best Student Status and Self-Evaluation, by Perceived Performance.....	57
XXI	Best Dressed Status and Self-Evaluation, by Perceived Performance.....	58
XXII	Key Student Status and Self-Evaluation, by Perceived Performance.....	59
XXIII	Friendship Status and Self-Evaluation, by Clique Membership.....	61
XXIV	Role Model Status and Self-Evaluation, by Clique Membership.....	62
XXV	Most Desired Friend Status and Self-Evaluation, by Clique Membership.....	63
XXVI	Athlete Status and Self-Evaluation, by Clique Membership.....	64
XXVII	Best Student Status and Self-Evaluation, by Clique Membership.....	65
XXVIII	Best Dressed Status and Self-Evaluation, by Clique Membership.....	66
XIX	Key Student Status and Self-Evaluation, by Clique Membership.....	67

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

In the past few decades, the use of sociometric analysis has gained considerable favor in the study of status-position in the small group setting. Considerable work has been done suggesting various ways whereby one can mathematically or otherwise manipulate sociometric data. There has been limited interest, however, in the study of the methodological implications of sociometric selection as a tool of analysis. The present study is designed to broach some methodological concerns surrounding sociometric nominations as applied to the study of status.

A brief survey of past research shows that status has been determined in terms of (a) an individual's formal position within a given structure, (b) socio-economic variables and/or (c) the number of nominations received from others in response to a given sociometric question. The latter approach, i.e., sociometric-status analysis, has been widely used in the study of the informal (small) group.

Sociometrists can be divided into two camps. On the one hand one finds sociometrists who identify status-position on the basis of frequency of interaction. Bales' categories of interaction have been used for instance in the analysis of status on a popularity dimension.¹ Such measurement of status involves observing and recording the number of times the various members of a group initiate

or receive social acts, while taking the type of interaction into account.

On the other hand, one finds sociometrists who identify status on the basis of the number of mentions an individual receives from others. This approach is more common perhaps and involves the study of choice patterns (attraction, repulsion, or indifference) within a specified grouping in matters relating to work, play, leadership, friendship, etc. The number of mentions received by individual members allows for some rank ordering of these members on various dimensions. This approach was pioneered by Moreno² and utilized with some modification by such students as Jennings,³ Katz,⁴ Hollander,⁵ and Coleman.⁶

It may be argued that two basic aspects of sociometric nominations have been somewhat ignored in recent literature and research. These include the context of choice and the nature of the criteria of selection (whether subjective or objective) influencing choice. A brief discussion of the problem will follow.

A Problem of Comparability in the Study of Sociometric Status

In the analysis of sociometric status, there has been a tendency to compare the frequently chosen subjects to those who are less frequently chosen. The line of demarcation between the two groups is determined arbitrarily. In his study of American youth, for instance, Coleman suggests that those nominated "often" in response to the following questions have a special (high) status:⁷

- Thinking of all the boys (girls) in this school, who would you most want to be like?

- Of all the boys (girls) in your grade, which boy (girl) would you most like to be friends with?
- If a boy (girl) came here to school and wanted to be in with the leading crowd, what boys (girls) would he get to be friends with? (Up to four names coded).
- What boys (girls) here in school do you go around with most often? (Up to ten names coded).

In his study, Coleman separately analyses each type of elite, i.e., the individuals nominated in response to each of the above questions. He briefly argues that "the notion of 'elite' depends upon the specific questions in which the choices were given."⁸ In other words, Coleman recognizes, like most sociometrists, that socio-metric questions vary and in themselves place some limitations upon the treatment of the "elite" in the subsequent analysis. Thus in this analysis he adopts an operationalist position on the grounds that: 1) the "elite" identified by the various questions have different characteristics, and 2) the boundaries of the populations from which selections are made vary from question to question.⁹ Coleman's treatment is perhaps typical of what one might find in the literature. In this thesis, in contrast, it is argued that there are useful ways by which "elites" may be grouped, depending on the nature of the questions asked.

Context of Nomination as a Variable in the Measurement of Socio-metric Status

It is suggested here that sociometric items may vary according to one important dimension, namely, the type of response which the

context of nomination evokes. Let us examine briefly two of the sociometric questions used by Coleman:

- 1) Thinking of all the boys (girls) in this school, who would you most want to be like?
- 2) If a boy (girl) came here to school and wanted to be in with the leading crowd, what boys (girls) would he get to be friends with?

The first item tends to evoke a personalized choice-status, while the latter tends to evoke an impersonalized response. That is, in the first case where the respondent is identifying a role model, the choice is made in terms of his own personal predisposition. In the latter case, the choice is made in terms of a given specific situation.

To the present author's knowledge, the distinction between the two types of choice-statuses (response) has not been empirically explored by sociometrists. The observation becomes all the more important in view of Dumont and Wilson's observation that "status is largely a function of the social context of evaluation."¹⁰

The present study is thus directed firstly at ascertaining whether it becomes meaningful and analytically fruitful to group elites on the basis of the context of nomination, viz., whether a personal or an impersonal (situational) context.

Criteria of Selection as a Variable

A further distinction that can be considered in differentiating types of sociometric items is the type of criteria available to the respondent making selections.

It should be mentioned that to a certain extent all selections

are subjective, in the sense that choices are made by respondents in terms of personal perceptions of the population from which selections are to be made. Nonetheless, a distinction can be made between selections that are made on purely subjective grounds such as when choosing a best friend, as opposed to responses to items such as "who is the best athlete?", where there are some objective criteria for evaluating athletic performance.

The Grouping of Elites

Differentiating then between contexts of nomination and qualitative differences in selection criteria, the following four possibilities obtain:

sociometric questions that evoke

- 1) personal contexts and subjective criteria,
- 2) personal contexts and objective criteria,
- 3) impersonal (situational) contexts and subjective criteria,
- 4) impersonal (situational) contexts and objective criteria.

The study is directed at appraising the utility of the suggested four logical possibilities in the context of consensus in sociometric nominations and in the analysis of sociometric status.

A distinction has been made first of all between sociometric questions that evoke responses to a personal context as opposed to an impersonal context. Inasmuch as personal contexts are particular to each respondent while impersonal (situational) contexts are "common" to all respondents, it is first hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1. There will be greater consensus in selection where contexts of nomination are impersonal than where contexts of nomination are personal.

Secondly it was suggested that one can differentiate between the types of criteria called forth by sociometric questions. It can be argued that objective criteria of evaluation tend to be more generally known and common to all members of a population than subjective criteria, particularly where the population is relatively small such as is the case here where choices are restricted to the respondent's high school student body. Assuming that such is the case, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 2. There will be greater consensus in selection where there are objective criteria for selection than where criteria are subjective.

An alternate way of evaluating the utility of the logical possibilities suggested is to examine whether or not the distinctions made are associated with certain related variables. One such variable which will be examined here is the respondents' self-evaluation, i.e., the extent to which a person desires to preserve or alter his self-image.

Students of sociometric status have found that members of a group are aware of their relative status. That is to say that findings support the idea that there is a significant correlation between self-ratings and the status ratings of one by one's associations.¹¹ In order to ascertain the relationship between sociometric status and self-evaluation, one must assume that status has some bearing upon

an individual's attitude toward his personal image and that adolescents desire to be liked or at least looked up to by peers. Allowing that group members are aware of their relative status and if the above assumptions are valid, one would hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 3. The higher the status, the more favorable the self-evaluation.

This hypothesis will be tested by comparing the respondents in terms of their status as defined by the sociometric nominations received in response to seven identification items included in the study. In testing the hypothesis, controls which might otherwise account for respondent self-evaluation will be introduced to the extent that the number of cases (n) permits. Further, the various elite will be compared in terms of self-evaluation following the logical possibilities developed above.

FOOTNOTES

¹ See:

Borgatta, E. F.

1960 "An Analysis of Social Interaction and Sociometric Perception", pp. 272-97 in J. L. Moreno, H. H. Jennings, et al (eds.), The Sociometry Reader. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

² Moreno first introduced the notion of sociometric measurement in the early 1920's. The concepts were introduced to America in 1932, just prior to Moreno's classic Who Shall Survive, published in 1934.

Nehnevajsa, Jiri

1960 "Sociometry: Decades of Growth." Pp. 707-754 in J. L. Moreno, H. H. Jennings, et al (eds.), The Sociometry Reader. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

³ See:

Jennings, Helen Hall

1947 "Leadership and Sociometric Choice". Sociometry X (February): 32-49

"Sociometric Differentiation of the Psychegroup and the Sociogroup." Sociometry X (February): 71-79

1948 Sociometry in Group Relations. Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education. (2nd ed. 1959).

1960 "Statistics of Social Configuration." Pp. 19-51 in J. L. Moreno, H. H. Jennings, et al (Eds.), The Sociometry Reader. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

"Sociometric Choice Process in Personality and Group Formation." Pp. 87-112 in J. L. Moreno, H. H. Jennings, et al (eds.), The Sociometry Reader. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

⁴ Katz has devoted much of his time and effort to the application of matrix analysis to the study of sociometric choices. See for instance:

1946 "A Matrix Approach to the Analysis of Sociometry Data." Sociometry IX (November): 340-7.

1960 "A New Status Index Derived from Sociometric Analysis." Pp. 266-71 in J. L. Moreno, H. H. Jennings, et al (eds.), The Sociometry Reader. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

⁵E. P. Hollander has concentrated upon the use of sociometric choices in the study of leadership and friendship. See for instance:

1954 "Peer Nominations of Leadership as a Predictor of the Pass-Fail Criteria in Naval Air Training." Journal of Applied Psychology, 38: 150-3.

Hollander, E. P., and Webb, W. B.

1955 "Leadership, Followership, and Friendship: An Analysis of Peer Nominations." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 50: 163-67.

⁶Coleman, J. S.

1960 "Electronic Processing of Sociometric Data for Groups up to 1,000 in Size." American Sociological Review, 25 (November): 722-27.

1961 The Adolescent Society. N. Y.: Free Press.

⁷These sociometric questions were included in Coleman's study of the adolescent society. By special status he is referring to those students "who exemplify, more than their fellows, the values current in the culture". See Coleman 1961, p. 98.

⁸Coleman 1961, p. 102.

⁹Coleman 1961, p. 102-3.

¹⁰Dumont, Richard G., and Wilson, William J.

1967 "Aspects of Concept Formation, Explication, and Theory Construction in Sociology." American Sociological Review, 32 (December): 985-95.

¹¹ Hepler, Manis, and Miyamoto and Dornbusch report findings to this effect. See a brief summary of the literature by:

Videbeck, Richard

1960 "Self-Conception and the Reactions of Others."
Sociometry 23: 351-9.

CHAPTER II

DATA AND PROCEDURES

Data Source

The data to be used were gathered as a part of a larger study carried out by Dr. B. Abu-Laban in the Spring of 1965. The questionnaire, adapted from work done by James S. Coleman,¹ was designed to study the characteristic features of the Lebanese youth society. Among other things, a number of sociometric identification items were included in the questionnaire.

The Sample

Twenty-five private and public schools were selected in such a way as to represent the various regions of the country and to include the major ethnic and religious groups in Lebanon. Most respondents attended sex-segregated schools which are typical in Lebanon. A total of 2,466 students from the upper-division classes (4th-7th secondary) completed the questionnaire. The data were gathered in the schools during class hours with particular effort directed at eliciting responses from the total upper-division student body.

The Data as Related to the Present Study

Sociometric charts were constructed only for those schools where the coverage was more or less complete and the respondents from the school did not exceed one hundred. The present study is thus limited to 12 of the 25 schools surveyed. The numbers of respondents

from these 12 schools range from 24 to 78; and they comprise 706 of the total (2,466) respondents included in the larger study.

Sociometric nominations were gathered in response to seven items (see Appendix A, Note A.) which allowed the respondents to choose any student within the upper-division classes of their school.² The respondents were asked to nominate:

1. the student most desired as a friend,
2. a role model among the students,
3. actual friends,
4. key students, i.e., the students to become friends with if one wants to get in with a leading clique,
5. the best athlete,
6. the best student,
7. the best dressed student.

For the purpose of the analysis, items 1 and 2 will be considered as sociometric nominations that evoke selection in terms of a personal context where the criteria of selection are subjective. Item 3 qualifies as personal-objective by reason of the actual phrasing of the question itself (the question asks of the respondent the names of the students he goes around with most often). Question number 4 evokes a choice within an impersonal (situational) context where the criteria of selection are subjective. Lastly, items 5, 6, and 7 can be argued to elicit a choice within an impersonal context where the criteria of selection are objective.

Sociometric Status

Sociometric status will be determined on the basis of the sum of differentially weighted direct and indirect choices. A direct choice applies to the case where individual A selects individual B. An indirect choice includes a third individual, i.e., where A selects individual C who selects individual B. In the latter case one has two direct choices, namely A-C and C-B, and, one indirect choice, that is A-B through C.

Indirect choices are identified by squaring the original sociometric nomination matrix.³ In more conventional usage such as that suggested by Festinger, matrix analysis has been used in identifying influence patterns and in determining cliques. It is suggested here that differentially weighted direct and indirect choices can also take into account the point raised by Katz, viz., the importance of taking into account "who chooses as well as how many choose".⁴

By summing the original matrix and the powered matrix one takes into account the number of choices received by the chooser while determining the relative status of any given respondent. In other words, the resulting score distinguishes between individuals with the same number of direct choices on the basis of the source of nomination, i.e., whether or not the nomination comes from an unselected peer or from a peer who himself has been chosen a given number of times.

The weighting of direct and indirect choices is somewhat arbi-

trary. In the study, direct choices are assigned a weight of 2 and an indirect choice a weight of 1. As a result an individual receiving 10 direct choices and 2 indirect choices would be assigned a status score of 22. Assigning such scores allows for rank ordering on any given status dimension. It should be pointed out that in no case can an individual be assigned a score greater than that which would result if all respondents chose the same individual. When this occurs, no indirect choices appear and the maximum status score is $N \times 2$.⁵

Once status scores have been obtained, respondents will be assigned to one of four categories of status, namely: High, Medium-High, Medium-Low, Low.⁶ Since it can be argued that status is relative to a specific context, it was decided that cutting points should be determined independently for each school as well as for each status dimension. To provide some uniformity however, the range of possible scores for any given school will be divided into quartiles respectively covering the four status categories, High to Low.

Consensus

The same scores can be used as a measure of consensus by taking individual scores as a proportion of the total number of selections made by the upper-division student body of a given school. Thus in a case where an individual has a score of 30 out of a possible 40 in connection with the best athlete matrix, there would be a .75 degree of consensus. In the analysis of the relationship between the type of status-choice and consensus, the discussion will limit itself

to the "elite" (i.e., those rated high on status dimensions). As mentioned above respondents will be compared in terms of self-evaluation, while taking into account their status on the various status dimensions. By self-evaluation, reference is made simply to a respondent's feeling about himself, that is whether or not he (she) likes himself the way he is, desires some change or desires to change completely. In order to guard against a spurious relationship between status and self-evaluation, the following control variables will be introduced:

- (1) Perceived performance: The distinction made here is in terms of a student's perception of his academic performance in the 1964-65 school year, be it excellent, good, fair, below average or poor. The high emphasis placed on academic performance in the Lebanese culture⁷ suggests that self-evaluation may be in part based upon the student's academic performance and should, therefore, be taken into account.
- (2) Membership in a leading clique: A distinction will be made here simply in terms of membership/non-membership. Given the emphasis placed in the literature on the importance of the peer group in "youth culture" it appears relevant to control for membership versus non-membership in a leading clique.

In all cases, Lambda or Goodman's Tau will be introduced as a measure of association so as to ascertain the nature of the relationships studied.

FOOTNOTES

¹ For further details regarding the data collected by Dr. B. Abu-Laban see:

1968 "Sources of College Aspirations of Lebanese Youth." The Journal of Developing Areas 2 (January): 225-40.

² In some cases respondents nominated non-school members in response to the sociometric questions. Such choices were eliminated in the matrix analysis.

³ For clarification of the matrix analysis discussion reference can be made to an illustration of the method, Appendix B.

⁴ Katz, L.

1960 "A New Status Index Derived from Sociometry Data." Pp. 266-71 in J. L. Moreno, H. H. Jennings, et al (eds.), The Sociometry Reader. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

⁵ A score larger than $N \times 2$ may result if self selection is involved. If self selection occurs, the powered matrix will show indirect choices that in fact do not exist. It then becomes necessary to correct for such cases.

⁶ The decision to use four status categories was arbitrary, and was based essentially upon the natural breaks suggested by the data.

⁷ See:

Abu-Labán, Baha

1966 "Some Correlates of Educational Aspirations of Lebanese Youth," a paper read at the Sixth World Congress of Sociology, Evian, France, (September): 4-11.

CHAPTER III

LOGICAL POSSIBILITIES AND CONSENSUS

The present chapter will present findings relevant to the first two hypotheses regarding consensus. The chapter will deal with the following relationships: a) the context of nomination and the degree of consensus, b) the criteria of selection and the degree of consensus, and c) context of nomination, criteria of selection and consensus, alternately holding the first two constant.

Context of Nomination and Consensus

It will be recalled that the variable "context of nomination" refers to a distinction made between personal and impersonal contexts of choice-statuses evoked by specific sociometric items. Table I shows that there is low consensus in 82 per cent of the elite selections which are made in terms of personal contexts as opposed to low consensus in only 34 per cent of the elite selections where the context is impersonal. In no case is there high consensus (i.e., nominees receiving more than 50 per cent of the maximum score possible) in elite selections where contexts are personal. On the other hand 20 per cent of the elites selected in terms of impersonal (situational) contexts received a status score which is greater than 50 per cent of the maximum possible. The table shows there is a 16 per cent improvement in prediction of consensus knowing the context of nomination. Such findings are in accord with hypothesis 1,

TABLE I
CONTEXT OF NOMINATION AND CONSENSUS
ON ELITE SELECTION

Context of nomination	Consensus*					Total
	Low	Medium low	Medium high	High		
Personal	82%	18	---	---	100% (22)	
Impersonal	34%	46	13	7	100% (68)	

Lambda b = .163

*The levels of consensus refer to the following quartiles:
 low: elite status score 0-25% of maximum score possible.
 medium low: elite status score 26-50% of maximum score possible.
 medium high: elite status score 51-75% of maximum score possible.
 high: elite status score 76-100% of the maximum score possible.

TABLE II
CRITERIA OF SELECTION AND CONSENSUS
ON ELITE SELECTION

Criteria of selection	Consensus*					Total
	Low	Medium low	Medium high	High		
Objective	25%	36	25	14	100% (36)	
Subjective	59%	41	---	---	100% (54)	

Lambda b = .082

*The levels of consensus refer to the following quartiles:
 low: elite status score 0-25% of maximum score possible.
 medium low: elite status score 26-50% of maximum score possible.
 medium high: elite status score 51-75% of maximum score possible.
 high: elite status score 76-100% of maximum score possible.

which states that "there will be greater consensus in selection where contexts of nomination are impersonal than where contexts of nomination are personal."

Criteria of Selection and Consensus

Table II presents the data relevant to the second hypothesis, namely, that "there will be greater consensus in selection where there are objective criteria of selection than where the criteria of selection are subjective." The table shows low consensus (less than 25 per cent of maximum score) in 25 per cent of the elite selections which are made on the basis of objective criteria, compared to 59 per cent of the nominations based on subjective criteria being low on consensus. In no case where subjective criteria of selection are invoked is there high consensus in nominations. Where sociometric items elicited objective criteria one finds that 39 per cent of the elites selected received a score greater than 50 per cent of the maximum, i.e. the score possible had one received all nominations. The data thus lends support to the second hypothesis although the association between criteria of selection and consensus is somewhat lower ($\Lambda_b = .08$) than was the case for the relationship between context of nomination and consensus.

To further explore the nature of the relationship, one can compare selection consensus in terms of both the criteria of selection and context of nomination. The relevant data are shown in Table IIIa and Table IIIb.

The data indicates that consensus tends to be lower when personal-subjective rather than personal-objective criteria of selection are invoked. Table IIIa shows a 28 per cent reduction in error in predicting consensus knowing the criteria of selection when the context of nomination is personal.¹ On the other hand, the association is low between criteria of selection and consensus in the case of nominations based on items evoking choice in terms of impersonal contexts ($\text{Tau b} = .045$).

The data presented in Table IIIb shows somewhat greater association between context of nomination and consensus in the case where subjective criteria are elicited (18 per cent as opposed to 10 per cent reduction in error). In both cases, however, there is a tendency towards greater consensus in responses elicited by questions evoking impersonal (situational) contexts of nomination.

The relationships between context of nomination, criteria of selection and consensus as presented in Tables IIIa and IIIb lend support to the evidence presented earlier, namely that there is a stronger relationship between the context of nomination and consensus than between the criteria of selection and consensus.

TABLE IIIa

CRITERIA OF SELECTION AND CONSENSUS, BY CONTEXT OF NOMINATION

Criteria of selection	Personal context of nomination			Impersonal context of nomination			Consensus*	Consensus	Total
	Low	Medium	High	Total	Low	Medium	High		
Objective	17%	50	33	-- 100% (12)	25%	36	25	14	100% (36)
Subjective	82%	18	--	-- 100% (22)	43%	57	--	--	100% (32)
Lambda b =	.286			Tau b = .045					22

*The levels of consensus are the same as used in Tables I and II

TABLE IIIb
 CONTEXT OF NOMINATION AND CONSENSUS, BY CRITERIA OF SELECTION

Objective criteria of selection	Consensus*	Subjective criteria of selection						Total
		Low	Medium	Low	Medium	High	Total	
Personal	17%	50	33	--	100% (12)	82%	18	--
Impersonal	25%	36	25	14	100% (36)	43%	57	--
Tau b = .103								Lambda b = .182
								23

*The levels of consensus are the same as used in Tables I and II.

FOOTNOTE

¹This difference should be carefully evaluated since consensus in the case of friendship nominations (the only case qualifying as personal-objective) refers to the extent to which nominations were reciprocated. Inasmuch as one can hardly expect all respondents to select the same individual as the one they go around with most often, it does not logically follow to measure consensus by taking an individual's score as a proportion of a maximum score possible had he received all nominations. The proportion of reciprocated nominations can be argued to be a better measure of consensus in friendship nominations. Inasmuch as the data is limited to only this item which qualifies as personal-objective it was included in the table.

CHAPTER IV

STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION

This chapter presents first of all the findings relevant to the third hypothesis regarding the relationship between status and respondent self-evaluation. It was hypothesized that "the higher the status the more favorable the self-evaluation." The second part of the chapter will consist of an analysis of the self-evaluation of the various types of elite. The elites will first be compared separately and then as grouped following the logical possibilities developed at the onset of the study.

The seven status dimensions included in the study were related to self-evaluation. (See Appendix C, Tables IX to XV). Contrary to our prediction, no association was found between status and self-evaluation. The measures of association computed on the tables range in value from .002 to .013. For all status levels, and regardless of the status dimension, approximately one out of ten respondents desires to change completely, six out of ten desire to change somewhat, and approximately three out of ten desire no change. The data clearly does not support the third hypothesis.

Two related variables were introduced earlier as possible confounding factors affecting the relationship between status and self-evaluation: 1) perceived academic performance, and, 2) membership in a leading clique.

Given the emphasis upon academic achievement among the youth studied, perceived academic performance was systematically introduced as a control variable. (See Appendix D, Tables XVI to XXII). The data does not indicate any noticeable change in the relationship between sociometric status and self-evaluation when perceived performance is held constant. The measures of association tabulated on these tables range from .003 to .021.

Membership in a leading clique being itself a dimension of status, was also held constant making possible comparisons between leading clique members and non-members. (See Appendix E, Tables XXIII to XXIX). Again, the data does not point out any change in the relationship between status and self-evaluation. The association between status and self-evaluation remains very low (Tau's vary from .002 to .039).

In light of the above findings, one is led to ask whether peer group status is of significant importance to the self-image of Lebanese youth. In the course of the survey, respondents were asked to rank a number of items in order of importance. (See questionnaire item #54, Appendix A, Note B). In response to this question, "being accepted and liked by other students" was ranked fourth (last) in importance by 40 per cent of the respondents, and third in order of importance by 35 per cent of the students. The data shows that peer group relations are perhaps not as important as suspected particularly in light of the fact that about 95 per cent of the students rank "pleasing my parents" either first or second in order of importance.

ELITES AND SELF-EVALUATION

The data shown in Table IV indicates little or no difference among elites identified on the seven status dimensions with regards to self-evaluation. Two cases vary somewhat. Three out of seven (43%) of the respondents nominated often as role models desire no change while only one out of six (17%) chosen as best dressed students desires no change. These two groups differ somewhat from the general population although the small number of cases precludes the possibility of making any general statements about the significance of the difference.

Tables V and VI allow for comparisons between the seven types of elites when perceived academic performance and clique membership are held constant.

A larger proportion (61%) of the students nominated often on any given status dimension also perform well academically. In this respect, the data indicates that a slightly larger proportion of elites with poorer academic performance desire some change or complete change. Once again the small (*n*) in many of the cells restricts one to descriptive comments. The data would indicate that academic performance is perhaps more important to the self-evaluation of elites than for the general student body. Table VI shows that 75 per cent of elite nominations are assigned to students who are also members of a leading clique. In the case of elites who are members of a leading clique,

approximately 15 per cent desire complete change as opposed to 10 per cent for the general population, and a smaller proportion desire no change.

The data shown in Tables V and VI further support the notion that peer group status-position is unrelated to self-evaluation inasmuch as approximately the same proportions of respondents with high status on the seven different dimensions desire complete change, some change or no change.

When comparing elites following the logical possibilities developed (Table VIIa, Table VIIb, and Table VIII) two observations can be made. First, there is no significant difference in self-evaluation between elites selected in response to sociometric items eliciting personal as opposed to impersonal contexts. Secondly, a greater proportion of elites selected on subjective criteria have no desire to change. This latter difference (37% versus 19%) disappears however when one controls for context of nomination and criteria of selection (See Table VIII).

The logical possibilities as developed do not point to differences in terms of self-evaluation as shown by the measures of association calculated for each cross-tabulation. The classificatory scheme suggested thus does not have any utility when it comes to pointing out differences among elites with regards to self-evaluation. However, the prior findings indicating that relative status-position has no relationship to self-evaluation suggests that the lack of distinctions which result from the use of the logical possibilities does not

necessarily reflect a weakness of the classificatory scheme. Further research is necessary to test the utility of the developed typology.

TABLE IV
ELITE TYPES AND SELF-EVALUATION

Elite types	Self-evaluation			Total
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	
Friendship	10%	62	28	100% (58)
Role model	---	57	43	100% (7)
Most desired friend	7%	60	33	100% (15)
Best athlete	12%	59	29	100% (17)
Best student	10%	60	30	100% (10)
Best dressed	17%	67	17	101% (6)
Key student	12%	51	36	99% (33)

TABLE V

ELITE TYPES AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Perceived academic performance

Above average

Average or below

Elite types	Self-evaluation			Self-evaluation		
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total	Complete change desired	No change desired
Friendship	10%	52	39	101% (31)	11%	74
Role model	---	67	33	100% (6)	---	100
Most desired friend	---	64	36	100% (11)	25%	50
Best athlete	14%	43	43	100% (7)	10%	70
Best student	10%	60	30	100% (10)	---	100
Best dressed	---	100	---	100% (2)	25%	50
Key student	9%	55	36	100% (22)	18%	45
						36
						99% (11)

TABLE VI

ELITE TYPES AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY CLIQUE MEMBERSHIP

Clique membership

	Member	Self-evaluation			Non-member			
		Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired
Elite types	15%	57	27	99% (40)	--	75	25	100% (14) 32
Friendship	--	40	60	100% (5)	--	100	--	100% (2)
Role model	--	50	50	100% (8)	25	50	25	100% (4)
Most desired friend	--	58	25	100% (12)	--	--	100	100% (2)
Best athlete	17%	57	29	100% (7)	--	50	50	100% (2)
Best student	14%	60	20	100% (5)	--	100	--	100% (1)
Best dressed	20%	43	43	100% (21)	--	67	33	100% (6)
Key student	14%							

TABLE VIIa
CONTEXT OF NOMINATION AND SELF-EVALUATION

Context of nomination	Self-evaluation			Total
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	
Personal	9%	65	25	99% (73)
Impersonal	12%	56	32	100% (66)
Tau b = .0001				

TABLE VIIb
CRITERIA OF SELECTION AND SELF-EVALUATION

Criteria of selection	Self-evaluation			Total
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	
Objective	12%	69	19	100% (81)
Subjective	9%	55	36	100% (55)
Tau b = .028				

TABLE VIII

CRITERIA OF SELECTION AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY CONTEXT OF NOMINATION

Context of nomination personal
Self-evaluation

Criteria of selection	Self-evaluation			Context of nomination impersonal Self-evaluation		
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total	Complete change desired	No change desired
Objective	5%	59	35	99% (22)	12%	61
Subjective	10%	62	29	101% (58)	12%	51
Tau b = .024				Tau b = .0001		
					101% (33)	34
					99% (33)	

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The study centered partly around the development of a classificatory scheme which would allow one to group members of a given population in terms of the number of nominations received in response to sociometric items. The logical possibilities were developed in an attempt to cope with two problems, 1) the comparability of population members receiving the same number of mentions and, 2) the comparability of population members nominated in response to "different" sociometric identification items. In attempting to evaluate the usefulness of the suggested approach, the study focused first upon the analysis of the relationship between context of nomination, criteria of selection and consensus and secondly upon the relationship between sociometric status and self-evaluation.

The data supports two of the hypotheses advanced in the study, namely that in sociometric nominations of "elites", there is:

- 1) greater consensus in selection where contexts of nomination are impersonal than where contexts of nomination are personal,
- 2) greater consensus in selection where there are objective criteria for selection than where criteria are subjective.

With regards to the breakdown into personal-subjective and personal-objective the measures of consensus are not truly comparable

although the indication is that the hypotheses would hold under such conditions if one gathered further data which would qualify as responses to sociometric items eliciting choice in a personal context with objective criteria of selection and if the data allowed for the use of the same or a comparable measure of consensus. The relationship between criteria of selection and consensus holds for sociometric items eliciting response in terms of impersonal contexts, but is weak when the contexts are personal.

The third hypothesis regarding the relationship between status and self-evaluation was not substantiated by the data. Related data suggests that peer group status may not have as much bearing as one might suspect upon self-evaluation among Lebanese youth.

In comparing the seven types of elites, no difference was found between the status dimension and self-evaluation. This finding remained unchallenged when comparing "elites":

- 1) holding perceived academic performance and leading clique membership constant, and,
- 2) following the logical possibilities developed at the onset of the study.

To the extent that the two major hypotheses put forth regarding the relationship between context of nomination, criteria of selection and the degree of consensus in sociometric nominations were supported, the evidence does attest to the utility of the status measurement used and lends support to the advanced proposition that comparability may result from inherent qualities of sociometric items such as the con-

text of nomination and criteria of selection evoked by the question.

The small number of identification items available in the analysis, however, leads to some reservations with regards to generalization that one might otherwise be tempted to make. Nonetheless, the findings indicate the need for further in depth study of the inherent qualities of data elicited in the application of sociometric modes of analysis. With regards to the present area of analysis, further research allowing for a larger number of sociometric items following the four developed logical possibilities would appear to be a fruitful endeavour.

The data relevant to the third hypothesis regarding the relationship between the status-position and the self-evaluation of Lebanese youth draws attention once again to much needed cross-cultural research.

This same finding raises an interesting point for present day educators. The tendency to discuss youth in terms of the "adolescent society" and/or "the adolescent culture", has led American educators (among others) to emphasize the importance of peer-relations, (such as the status-position of adolescents among peers) in the development of the adolescent personality and in the relationship between students and the school system. The present findings would suggest that it might be fruitful to re-examine systematically the network of relationships operative within the peer group as well as between the peer group and larger systems such as the school system.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Coleman, James S.

1961 The Adolescent Society. N.Y.: Free Press

Hare, A. P.

1962 Handbook of Small Group Research. N.Y.: Free Press

Jennings, Helen Hall

1948 Sociometry in Group Relations. Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education. (2nd ed., 1959)

Moreno, J. L., H. H. Jennings, et al (eds.)

The Sociometry Reader. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

Abu-Laban, Baha

1968 "Sources of College Aspirations of Lebanese Youth." The Journal of Developing Areas 2 (January): 225-40

Alexander, Jr., C. Norman

1964 "Peer Influences on Adolescent Educational Aspirations and Attainments." American Sociological Review 29 (August): 568-75

Coleman, James S.

1960 "Electronic Processing of Sociometric Data for Groups up to 1,000 in Size." American Sociological Review 25 (November): 722-27

Dumont, Richard G. and William J. Wilson

1967 "Aspects of Concept Formation, Explication, and Theory Construction in Sociology." American Sociological Review 32 (December): 985-95

Goslin, David A.

1962 "Accuracy of Self-Perception and Social Acceptance." Sociometry 25: 286-96

Hall, Peter M.

1966 "Identification with the Delinquent Subculture and Level of Self-Evaluation." Sociometry 29 (February): 46-58

Hollander, E. P.

1954 "Peer Nominations of Leadership as a Predictor of the Pass-Fail Criteria in Naval Air Training." Journal of Applied Psychology 38: 150-53

Hollander E. P. and W. B. Webb

1955 "Leadership, Followership, and Friendship: An Analysis of Peer Nominations." Journal of Abnormal Psychology 50: 163-67

Jennings, Helen Hall

1947 "Leadership and Sociometric Choice." Sociometry X (February): 32-49

1947 "Sociometric Differentiation of the Psychegroup and the Sociogroup." Sociometry X (February): 71-79

Katz, E. P.

1946 "A Matrix Approach to the Analysis of Sociometry Data." Sociometry IX (November): 340-7

Lana, Robert E., Willard Vaughn, and Elliot McGinnies

1960 "Leadership and Friendship Status as Factors in Discussion Group Interaction." The Journal of Social Psychology 52: 127-34

Videbeck, Richard E.

1960 "Self-Conception and the Reactions of Others." Sociometry 23: 351-9

UNPUBLISHED PAPERS

Abu-Laban, Baha

1966 "Some Correlates of Education & Aspirations of Lebanese Youth." Paper read at the Sixth World Congress of Sociology, Evian, France (September 4-11)

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS TAKEN FROM DR. B. ABU-LABAN'S
1965 LEBANESE HIGH SCHOOL SURVEY

A. The present study is based on the following sociometric questions which have been taken from Dr. Abu-Laban's Lebanese high school survey:

#22 What boys (girls) here in school do you go around with most often? (six nominations possible).

#27 Of all the students in your school, which one...

- a. is the best athlete?
- b. is the best student?
- c. would you most like to be friends with?
- d. would you want to be like?
- e. knows how to dress most fashionably?

N.B. Item e. was included only in the female questionnaire.

#30 If a student came here to school and wanted to get in with the leading clique, which boys (girls) should he get to be friends with? (four names possible).

B. Other questionnaire items used in the present study include:

6 Which of the following categories accurately describes your grade average this year?

- a. excellent
- b. good
- c. fair
- d. below average
- e. poor

#24 Would you say you are a part of a leading clique in school?

- a. yes
- b. no

#49 Check the category which comes closest to your feeling about yourself:

- a. I do not like myself the way I am; I would like to change completely.
- b. There are many things I would like to change, but not completely.

#49 (continued)

 c. I would like to stay very much the same; there is very little I would change.

#54 How important is each of the following items to you?
(Rank 1 to 4)

 a. pleasing my parents
 b. learning as much as possible in school
 c. living up to my religious ideals
 d. being accepted and liked by other students

APPENDIX B

THE MATRIX ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE USED IN DETERMINING SOCIOMETRIC STATUS

An Illustration

ORIGINAL MATRIX OF FRIENDSHIP NOMINATIONS.

CARMELITE GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL

FRIENDSHIP NOMINATIONS													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1) Bashir, H.	x		x										
2) Doumit, N.	x	x	x	x									
3) Farris, N. A.			x										
4) Farris, N. Y.		x			x								
5) Khoury, N.	x		x										
6) Mur'iby, T.			x	x						x			
7) Munlo, B.			x	x									
8) Nasel, M.	x	x	x										
9) Nassar, W.													
10) Ahlabi, M.				x		x							
11) Awwad, J.													
12) Halabi, M.			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
13) Hial, M.	x				x					x			
14) Jobbour, S.	x			x						x		x	
15) Slaimou, M.			x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
16) Zoblit, A.		x	x	x	x								
17) Abboud, A.							x			x	x	x	x
18) Abu Deeb, S.					x				x	x	x	x	x
19) Aryoub, L.			x	x						x	x	x	x
20) Clobodian, N.													
21) Habib, M.									x	x	x	x	x
22) Haqan, M.								x		x	x	x	x
23) Jan'a, J.			x			x				x	x	x	x
24) Khat, R.								x		x	x	x	x
25) Khoury, N.					x			x	x	x	x	x	x
26) Kourban, A.					x					x	x	x	x
27) Ma'louf, B.					x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
28) Mur'iby, K.					x			x	x	x	x	x	x
29) Nassar, A.					x					x	x	x	x
30) Najarion, S.					x			x	x	x	x	x	x
31) Nimeh, N.					x	x	x			x	x	x	x
32) Sarkis, N.					x	x	x			x	x	x	x
33) Shahhal, F.			x							x		x	
34) Shahhal, H.					x					x		x	
35) Tarabay, A.					x								
36) Tarabay, H.						x							
37) Arkoun, M.							x						
38) Draby, M.							x						
39) Dahdah, M.								x					
40) Faroh, F.								x					
41) Jobally, S.									x	x	x	x	x
42) Kaddour, A.									x	x	x	x	x
43) Munlo, B.									x				
44) Makrouh, J.										x			
45) Sarkis, M.										x			
46) Tobibuch, G.											x		
47) Mur'iby, I.											x		

The above matrix shows the direct nominations (choices) made by the students of the Carmelite Girls High School in response to the questionnaire item asking them to name the students they went around with most often. The column totals indicate the number of mentions each student receives from other members of the upper-division student body of the school. These choices are direct choices and were assigned a weight of 2. Respondent 1 thus received a direct nomination score of 2, respondent 2 a score of 2, respondent 3 a score of 10, etc.

This matrix was then powered (once removed) to identify second order relations, i.e., the indirect choices. The powered matrix appears on the following page.

SECOND ORDER MENTIONS, CARMELITE GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL

		CARMELITE GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION		FRIENDSHIP NOMINATIONS	
1	Bashir, H.	①	2	1	2
2	Doumi, N.	①	1	3	2
3	Faris, N.A.	①	1	1	1
4	Faris, N.Y.	②	1	1	1
5	Khoury, N.	①	1	1	1
6	Murabty, T.	1	②	1	1
7	Munira, B.	1	1	③	1
8	Naser, M.	1	1	2	③
9	Nasser, W.		⑥		
10	Ahdab, M.		②	1	1
11	Awwad, J.		⑤		
12	Holabi, M.	1	1	②	1
13	Hilal, M.	1	1	③	1
14	Jabbour, S.	1	1	2	③
15	Sliman, M.	1	1	④	1
16	Zoblit, A.	1	1	⑤	2
17	Abboud, A.	1	1	⑥	1
18	Abu Deeb, S.	1	1	⑦	3
19	Ayyoub, L.	1	1	1	③
20	Cobodian, N.			⑧	
21	Habib, M.	1	1	1	①
22	Hayon, M.			1	①
23	Jam'a, J.	1	1	1	①
24	Khatat, R.			2	1
25	Khoury, N.			1	1
26	Kourban, A.			1	2
27	Melouf, B.	1	1	3	2
28	Murabty, K.			1	1
29	Nassar, A.			1	2
30	Nizarian, S.			1	1
31	Nimreh, N.			1	1
32	Sarkis, N.			2	2
33	Shahhal, F.			1	1
34	Shahhal, H.			2	2
35	Taraboy, A.			1	1
36	Taraboy, H.			1	1
37	Ankouni, M.			2	2
38	Oreuby, M.			1	1
39	Dabdah, M.			1	1
40	Farah, F.			1	1
41	Jabaly, S.			1	1
42	Kaddour, A.			1	1
43	Munira, B.			1	1
44	Makouk, J.			1	1
45	Sarkis, M.			1	1
46	Tobbeh, G.			1	1
47	Wihay, I.			1	1

The above matrix is the powered original sociometric choice matrix of the Carmelite Girls High School upper-division school population. The column totals indicate the number of second order (indirect) mentions attributable to any given student in the school. These indirect choices were assigned a weight of one and added to the weighted column scores of the original matrix. Individual 1 thus received a total status score of $2 + 0 = 2$, individual 2 received a status score of $2 + 0 = 2$, individual 3 received a status score of $10 + 9 = 19$, etc.

The major diagonal (circle values) reflects the number of reciprocated choices. Summing all the figures in the major diagonals gives the total number of reciprocated choices made by the respondents appearing in the matrix.

In all cases, the figures appearing in the major diagonal were excluded from the column totals as they do not reflect indirect choices.



APPENDIX C

TABLES IX - XV

SOCIO METRIC STATUS DIMENSION AND BY SELF-EVALUATION

Note: The N varies from table to table and is less than 706 due to lack of information regarding self-evaluation

TABLE IX
FRIENDSHIP STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION

Friendship status	Self-evaluation			Total
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	
High	10%	62	28	100% (58)
Medium high	9%	58	32	99% (84)
Medium low	7%	57	37	101% (210)
Low	11%	56	33	100% (322)
				(N=674)*

Tau b = .003

* Of the 674 respondents, 10 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 33 per cent desire no change.

TABLE X
ROLE MODEL STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION

Role model status	Self-evaluation			Total
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	
High	---	57	43	100% (7)
Medium high	13%	50	37	100% (8)
Medium low	---	73	27	100% (22)
Low	13%	56	31	100% (325)
				(N=362)*

Tau b = .006

* Of the 362 respondents, 12 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 31 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XI
MOST DESIRED FRIEND STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION

Most desired friend status	Self-evaluation			Total
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	
High	7%	60	33	100% (15)
Medium high	10%	55	35	100% (29)
Medium low	5%	62	33	100% (114)
Low	10%	56	34	100% (493)
				(N=651)*

Tau b = .002

* Of the 651 respondents, 9 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 34 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XII
ATHLETE STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION

Athlete status	Self-evaluation			Total
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	
High	12%	59	29	100% (17)
Medium high	25%	37	37	99% (8)
Medium low	17%	50	33	100% (12)
Low	9%	57	34	100% (638)
				(N=675)

Tau b = .002

* Of the 675 respondents, 10 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 34 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XIII
BEST STUDENT STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION

Best student status	Self-evaluation			Total
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	
High	10%	60	30	100% (10)
Medium high	---	70	30	100% (10)
Medium low	---	63	37	100% (16)
Low	10%	57	33	100% (577)
				(N=613)*

Tau b = .001

*Of the 613 respondents, 9 per cent desire complete change, 58 per cent desire some change, 33 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XIV
BEST DRESSED STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION

Best dressed status	Self-evaluation			Total
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	
High	17%	56	17	100% (6)
Medium high	17%	56	17	100% (6)
Medium low	20%	20	60	100% (5)
Low	6%	57	37	100% (232)
				(N=249)*

Tau b = .013

*Of the 249 respondents, 7 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 36 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XV
KEY STUDENT STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION

Key student status	Self-evaluation			Total
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	
High	12%	51	36	99% (33)
Medium high	8%	53	39	100% (36)
Medium low	5%	63	32	100% (97)
Low	11%	56	33	100% (505)
				(N=671)*

Tau b = .003

* Of the 671 respondents, 10 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 33 per cent desire no change.

APPENDIX D

TABLES XVI - XXII

STATUS DIMENSION AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Note: The N varies from table to table and is less than 706 due to lack of information regarding self-evaluation and perceived performance

TABLE XVI

FRIENDSHIP STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Perceived academic performance

Above average

Average or below

Self-evaluation

Self-evaluation

Friendship status	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total		Self-evaluation			(N=327)*
				Complete change desired	No change desired	Some change desired	No change desired		
High	10%	52	39	101% (31)		11%	74	15	Tau b = .005
Medium high	11%	60	29	100% (45)		8%	53	39	Tau b = .010
Medium low	5%	53	42	100% (105)		9%	60	32	*Of the 327 respondents, 8 per cent desire complete change, 55 per cent desire some change, 37 per cent desire no change.
Low	9%	55	36	100% (146)		13%	55	31	*Of the 352 respondents, 14 per cent desire complete change, 56 per cent desire some change, 30 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XVII

ROLE MODEL STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Perceived academic performance

Above average

Self-evaluation

Role-model status	Self-evaluation			Average or below		
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total	Complete change desired	Some change desired
High	---	67	33	100% (3)	---	100% (1)
Medium high	13%	50	37	100% (8)	---	---
Medium low	---	79	21	100% (14)	---	---
Low	12%	53	35	100% (153)	13%	58
				(N=198)*	(N=178)*	(N=178)*

 $Tau b = .014$

* Of the 198 respondents, 11 per cent desire complete change, 55 per cent desire some change, 34 per cent desire no change.

 $Tau b = .011$

* Of the 178 respondents, 12 per cent desire complete change, 58 per cent desire some change, 30 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XVIII

MOST DESIRED FRIEND STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Average or below
Perceived academic performance

Most desired friend status	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Self-evaluation			Total	Total
				Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired		
High	---	64	36	100% (11)	25%	50	25	100% (4)
Medium high	11%	63	26	100% (19)	10%	40	50	100% (10)
Medium low	4%	55	42	101% (55)	7%	69	24	100% (59)
Low	9%	54	37	100% (238)	11%	57	32	100% (248)
				(N=323)*			(N=321)*	

Tau b = .004

Tau b = .011

* Of the 323 respondents, 8 per cent desire complete change, 55 per cent desire some change, 37 per cent desire no change.

* Of the 321 respondents 11 per cent desire complete change, 58 per cent desire some change, 31 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XIX

ATHLETE STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Perceived academic performance

Above average

Self-evaluation

Average or below

Athlete status	Self-evaluation			Self-evaluation		
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired
High	14%	43	43	100% (7)	10%	70
Medium high	20%	40	40	100% (5)	33%	33
Medium low	---	67	33	100% (6)	33%	33
Low	8%	55	37	100% (309)	11%	58
				(N=327)*		(N=341)*

Tau b = .003

* Of the 327 respondents 8 per cent desire complete change, 55 per cent desire some change, 37 per cent desire no change.

Tau b = .007

* Of the 341 respondents 11 per cent desire complete change, 58 per cent desire some change, 31 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XX

BEST STUDENT STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Perceived academic performance

Above average

Average or below

Self-evaluation

Best student status	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total	Self-evaluation			Total
					Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	
High	10%	60	30	100% (10)	---	---	---	---
Medium high	---	78	22	100% (9)	---	---	---	100% (1)
Medium low	---	67	33	100% (15)	---	---	---	100% (1)
Low	9%	55	36	100% (270)	11%	59	31	101% (301)
				(N=304)*				(N=303)*

Tau b = .006

(N=304)*

Tau b = .010

(N=303)*

* Of the 304 respondents, 8 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 35 per cent desire no change.

* Of the 303 respondents, 11 per cent desire complete change, 58 per cent desire some change, 31 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XXI

BEST DRESSED STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Perceived academic performance

		Above average				Average or below					
		Self-evaluation				Self-evaluation					
Best dressed status	Complete change desired	Some change desired		No change desired		Total	Complete change desired		Some change desired		Total
		---	100	---	100% (2)		25%	50	25	100% (4)	
High	---	100	---	100% (2)			25%	50	25	100% (4)	58
Medium high	---	67	33	100% (3)			33%	67	---	100% (3)	
Medium low	17%	33	50	100% (6)			---	---	---	---	(0)
Low	7%	54	39	100% (136)			5%	61	34	100% (95)	
					(N=147)*						(N=102)*

Tau b = .021

* Of the 147 respondents, 7 per cent desire complete change, 54 per cent desire some change, 39 per cent desire no change.

Tau b = .015

* Of the 102 respondents, 7 per cent desire complete change, 61 per cent desire some change, 30 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XXXI

KEY STUDENT STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Perceived academic performance

Key student status	Self-evaluation			Perceived academic performance			Average or below	
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total
High	9%	55	36	100% (22)	18%	45	37	100% (11)
Medium high	9%	45	45	99% (22)	7%	64	30	101% (14)
Medium low	---	59	41	100% (49)	11%	66	23	100% (47)
Low	9%	55	35	99% (231)	11%	57	32	100% (268)
				(N=324)*				(N=340)*

Tau b = .005

Tau b = .006

* Of the 324 respondents, 8 per cent desire complete change, 55 per cent desire some change, 37 per cent desire no change.

* Of the 340 respondents, 11 per cent desire complete change, 58 per cent desire some change, 31 per cent desire no change.

APPENDIX E
TABLES XXIII - XXIX
STATUS DIMENSION AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY
LEADING CLIQUE MEMBERSHIP

Note: The N varies from table to table and is less than 706 due to lack of information regarding self-evaluation and clique membership

TABLE XXIII

FRIENDSHIP STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY CLIQUE MEMBERSHIP
 Membership in leading clique

Friendship status	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Self-evaluation			Non-member		
				Total	Complete change desired	Some change desired	Total	Complete change desired	Some change desired
High	15%	57	27	99% (40)	---	75	25	100% (14)	61
Medium high	12%	57	31	100% (58)	6%	65	30	101% (17)	
Medium low	6%	55	39	100% (141)	9%	53	37	99% (43)	
Low	11%	59	30	100% (219)	18%	46	37	101% (74)	
				(N=458)*				(N=148)*	

Tau b = .005

Tau b = .022

* Of the 458 respondents, 10 per cent desire complete change, 58 per cent desire some change, 33 per cent desire no change.

* Of the 148 respondents, 12 per cent desire complete change, 53 per cent desire some change, 34 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XXIV

ROLE MODEL STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY CLIQUE MEMBERSHIP
 Membership in leading clique

Role model status	Member				Non-member			
	Self-evaluation				Self-evaluation			
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total
High	---	40	60	100% (5)	---	100	---	100% (2)
Medium high	17%	50	33	100% (6)	---	---	100	100% (1)
Medium low	---	77	23	100% (13)	---	67	33	100% (3)
Low	14%	56	30	100% (227)	13%	56	31	100% (61)
				(N=251)*			(N=67)*	

Tau b = .011

* Of the 251 respondents, 13 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 30 per cent desire no change.

Tau b = .039

* Of the 67 respondents, 12 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 31 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XXV

MOST DESIRED FRIEND STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY CLIQUE MEMBERSHIP
 Membership in leading clique

Member

Self-evaluation

Most desired friend status	Self-evaluation			Non-member		
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total	Complete change desired	Some change desired
High	---	50	50	100% (8)	25%	50
Medium high	14%	48	38	100% (21)	---	67
Medium low	6%	57	37	100% (79)	6%	65
Low	10%	58	32	100% (289)	13%	51
				(N=397)*		(N=138)*

Tau b = .004

* Of the 397 respondents, 9 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 33 per cent desire no change.

Tau b = .010

* Of the 38 respondents, 12 per cent desire complete change, 54 per cent desire some change, 35 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XXVI

ATHLETE STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY CLIQUE MEMBERSHIP
Membership in leading clique

Athlete status	Self-evaluation			Non-member		
	Member			Self-evaluation		
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total	Complete change desired	Some change desired
High	17%	58	25	100% (12)	---	100% (2)
Medium high	25%	---	75	100% (4)	100%	---
Medium low	10%	60	30	100% (10)	---	100% (1)
Low	9%	58	33	100% (433)	12%	53
				(N=459)*	35	100% (141)
				(N=144)*		

Tau b = .009

Tau b = .016

* Of the 459 respondents, 10 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 33 per cent desire no change.

* Of the 144 respondents, 12 per cent desire complete change, 53 per cent desire some change, 33 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XXVII

BEST STUDENT STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY CLIQUE MEMBERSHIP
 Membership in leading clique

Best student status	Member			Non-member		
	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total	Complete change desired	No change desired
High	14%	57	29	100% (7)	---	50
Medium high	---	71	29	100% (7)	---	100
Medium low	---	58	42	100% (12)	---	75
Low	10%	57	33	100% (305)	12%	57
				(N=431)*		(N=120)*

Tau b = .002

* Of the 431 respondents, 10 per cent desire complete change, 58 per cent desire some change, 33 per cent desire no change.

Tau b = .016

* Of the 120 respondents, 11 per cent desire complete change, 57 per cent desire some change, 33 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XXVIII
BEST DRESSED STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY CLIQUE MEMBERSHIP
Membership in leading clique

Best dressed status	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Self-evaluation			Non-member		
				Total	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Total	
High	20%	60	20	100% (5)	---	100	---	100% (1)	
Medium high	20%	60	20	100% (5)	---	---	---	---	(0)
Medium low	20%	20	60	100% (5)	---	---	---	---	(0)
Low	7%	57	36	100% (142)	6%	52	42	100% (52)	
				(N=157)*				(N=53)*	

Tau b = .017

* Of the 157 respondents, 8 per cent desire complete change, 56 per cent desire some change, 36 per cent desire no change.

Tau b = .014

* Of the 53 respondents, 6 per cent desire complete change, 53 per cent desire some change, 41 per cent desire no change.

TABLE XXIX

KEY STUDENT STATUS AND SELF-EVALUATION, BY CLIQUE MEMBERSHIP

Membership in leading clique

Member

Self-evaluation
Non-member

Key student status	Complete change desired	Some change desired	No change desired	Self-evaluation		Self-evaluation		Total
				Total	desired	desired	desired	
High	14%	43	43	100% (21)	---	---	67	100% (6)
Medium high	12%	48	40	100% (25)	---	63	37	100% (8)
Medium low	4%	63	33	100% (76)	6%	65	29	100% (17)
Low	11%	58	31	100% (334)	15%	50	35	100% (115)
				(N=456)*				(N=146)*

Tau b = .007

*Of the 456 respondents, 10 per cent desire complete change, 58 per cent desire some change, 33 per cent desire no change.

Tau b = .011

*Of the 146 respondents, 12 per cent desire complete change, 53 per cent desire some change, 35 per cent desire no change.

B29905